

DRAFT THIRD EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE: FURTHER COMMENTS BY
ZOOLOGISTS. Z.N.(S.) 2250.

(1) *Chapter III. Criteria of Publication Arts 7-9.* (See also
Z.N.(S.) 2182). By R.B. Clark (*University of Newcastle-
upon-Tyne, U.K.*)

At the request of the Secretary of I.C.Z.N., the Working Group on Taxonomy, Systematics and Biological Recording of the Committee of European Science Research Councils was asked to give its views on the proposed revision of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. The Chairman, Professor R.B. Clark, (*Department of Zoology, The University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne*) sent the following observations made by the Zoology Section of the Working Group at their meeting in Strasbourg on 25-26 April 1978. (A list of the members is attached):-

Criteria of Publication

Members of the Group are well aware of the arguments that can be deployed for and against a revision of provisions in the Code that relate to particular methods of reproduction (xerox, microfiche, microfilm, etc.) which may in future supplement previously conventional methods of publication. The Working Group regards it as vital that the International Commission remains in firm control of the situation.

Whatever the methods of reproduction that will eventually fall within the provisions of a revised Code, with advantages and disadvantages that each will bring, there is a strong feeling among members of the Working Group, that they are secondary to ensuring that the existence of descriptions of new species and taxonomic revisions affecting nomenclature is known to workers in the appropriate subject and that they can gain access to the publications.

The draft of Article 8 in the 3rd edition of the Code which presumably, in part, addresses itself to this need, stipulates that a work must be published in "an edition containing *numerous* copies" and that the publication shall be "for the *purposes* of scientific record." Vagueness about how many copies are regarded as sufficiently 'numerous' to comply with this Article and the motivation of the author and his 'purposes' for publishing appear to the Working Group still to leave uncertainty as to what

constitutes valid publication and, equally important, to make these elements in the Article ultimately unenforceable.

The Working Group therefore *recommends* that, as a means of clarifying this issue and of making known the existence of nomenclatural changes that are validly published, the International Commission considers making mandatory the present recommendation in the Code (General Recommendation 24, Appendix E) that authors submit copies of their works to the editors of the Zoological Record. A test for validity of names should then include reference to them in Zoological Record within a stated number of years.

Alternatively, or perhaps in addition to this recommendation, the Working Group, being aware that there is always a long delay before publication of the Zoological Record, *recommends* that the International Commission considers ways in which this function could be discharged more speedily, possibly in a separate publication dedicated to this task.

By this means individual authors would not be required to exercise their own judgement as to whether or not a name had been validly published under the imprecise terms stated in Article 8, and at the same time would be informed of the existence of valid publications, whatever authorized method of reproduction was used.

Criteria of availability

Referring to the inadequate control by referees and editors, the Working Group acknowledges that as with other branches of science, there is a wide spectrum of quality in taxonomic publications, reflecting the variable standards and experience of editors, editorial boards and referees. Whereas in other branches of science inferior work can be safely ignored without detriment to the science, in taxonomic literature all publications have, in a formal sense, equal standing, and none can be ignored. The International Commission has, of course, been aware of this unusual feature of taxonomic literature and numerous recommendations in the 2nd edition of the Code exhort editors on their responsibilities. The Working Group regrets that it can offer no practical recommendations on how the present situation can be improved by additional legislation in the Code.

The membership of the Working Group is given overleaf.

**MEMBERSHIP OF THE ESRC AD HOC GROUP ON BIOLOGICAL
RECORDING, SYSTEMATICS AND TAXONOMY.**

ZOOLOGY SECTION

<i>Austria.</i>	Professor R. Schuster.	<i>Netherlands.</i>	Dr. E. Schenk.
<i>Belgium.</i>	Professor W. Verheyen.	<i>Norway.</i>	Dr. A. Loken.
<i>Denmark.</i>	Professor A. Michelsen.	<i>Portugal.</i>	Professor C. Almaca.
<i>Finland.</i>	Dr. M. Meinander.	<i>Spain.</i>	Professor E. Balcells.
<i>France.</i>	Professor J. Forest.	<i>Sweden.</i>	Professor E. Dahl.
<i>Germany.</i>	Professor O. Kraus.	<i>Switzerland.</i>	Professor W. Sauter.
<i>Ireland.</i>	Professor P. O'Ceidigh.	<i>United</i>	
<i>Italy.</i>	Professor F. Lamberti.	<i>Kingdom.</i>	Professor R.B. Clark.

Miscellaneous Comments

(2) By George C. Steyskal (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington. D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*)

Articles 4, 5, et passim.

The term epithet is entirely proper for the word forming the 2nd term of the binomen and the 3rd term of the trinomen. In botany, it has been used perhaps from the inception of nomenclatural rules. Its history in grammar as the designation of either a word or a phrase added or 'applied' to a name and its later use, except for some unfortunate derogatory connotation in vernacular usage, for any kind of word or words, adjectives, genitive or other phrases, nouns in apposition, etc., applied to a name make it perhaps uniquely suitable for nomenclatural use.

Article 8. (see also Z.N.(S.) 2182)

Inasmuch as "assures numerous identical copies" (2) does not assure that those numerous copies have ever been distributed and inasmuch as the word "numerous" is not capable of precise definition, some statement of the exact minimal number of copies needed to satisfy the requirements should be included. It should be feasible to establish firmly the number of copies in the primary distribution. Furthermore, the word "identical" is too restrictive; differences in size, binding, or nature of material (paper or synthetic sheet) would prevent its application.

Article 9. (see also Z.N.(S.) 2182)

Category (3) is poorly defined. The meaning of "indirect electrostatic reproduction" is not clear. Publication techniques are undergoing so much change that the wording of (3) must be more